

Comments From Other Commissions Regarding Policy Related to Proposed Renaming of City Facilities

Reno Arts & Culture Commission: At their January meeting, the RACC decided they would like to be a part of this process after all. They did not have any edits or suggestions for the draft policy at this time but would like to be included in the next joint meeting.

Recreation & Parks Commission: The RPC approved the minutes from the Joint Historical Resources Commission, Human Rights Commission, and Recreation and Parks Commission meeting. The meeting was held to discuss draft City guidelines and policy relating to naming or renaming City streets, parks and other facilities. The RPC also approved the list of suggestions related to the guidelines/policy, with the direction to follow up on Historical Resources Commission's desire to be the "lead" commission, and to clarify the final bulleted suggestion to read, "Consider adding Nevada Historical Society be named to the committee list."

Human Rights Commission: . (Excerpt from minutes)**Review, discussion, and possible recommendations regarding City guidelines and potential policy related to naming or renaming City streets, parks, and other facilities (For Possible Action)**

Community Liaison Opferman advised that the goal of this discussion is not to approve the draft document presented, entitled "Procedural Requirements to Name or Rename City of Reno Facilities", but to provide recommendations and summarize changes before it is brought back to City Council. She commented that the document has been updated with changes from the August meeting and that she is seeking further comments from the Commission.

Chair Savoy reviewed the suggestions made during the joint meeting and added that funding recommendations had not changed and were left to the City Council. Concerns regarding the application cost in section C for an individual seeking consideration of a name change were discussed at length. Community Liaison Opferman advised that an analysis of the cost is required, but the cost of that analysis does not fall on the requestor.

Vice Chair Young stated that her specific concerns were that the application fee remains as a nominal procedural fee and is not prohibitive. Councilmember Duerr responded that if the City considers the renaming, the City will pay for the name change and it is not the responsibility of the advocate for the renaming. She recommended that the Commission conveys this directive in their comments. Commissioners Castro-Borjorquez, Barkawi, and Hassen concurred.

Community Liaison Opferman summarized the direction from the Commission to the Council that they recommend that costs not be prohibitive and that the advocate not bear the burden of the name change. She added that it is helpful if the advocate provides their research and works with City staff. She advised that she would pass this on to Council.

In section D, the Commission concurred regarding the makeup of the committees to be appointed annually. The importance of the committees being appointed annually versus ad hoc was discussed.

Within section E, Community Liaison Opferman asked for recommendations regarding the timeframe for action on a request. Chair Savoy recommended simplification of the timeframe but concurred with Vice Chair Young's concerns that the timeframe be no longer than 120 days as in the original policy.

Community Liaison Opferman requested that Commissioners send any further recommendations to her so that she can incorporate their recommendations into the document to be presented to Council.